

BACONIANA

VOL. XXIII.

NO. 92.

JANUARY, 1939

EDITORIAL.

THE search for Spenser's tomb, although a great disappointment to the Bacon Society, has not been without distinct advantage. For several months before excavation was begun many references appeared in the leading daily newspapers and magazines to the Society's enterprise and there was much speculation with regard to the possibility of discoveries of a sensational character. During the search the topic was of course again "in the news," receiving front page publicity in several of the "dailies," and the Paramount News Service included it in a topical news reel. With less than twenty-four hours' notice arrangements were made for a film portrait of Mr. B. G. Theobald, the Society's President, seated in one of the beautiful oak panelled rooms at Canonbury Tower, once a residence of Francis Bacon and now the headquarters of the Bacon Society. Mr. Theobald, who was allowed a speech of one minute, was followed by Mr. Desmond Macarthy, who spoke in opposition and photographs were shown of places associated with the lives of Bacon and Shakspeare. The news reel was exhibited in all parts of England and subsequently in America, so that, although the time allotted to each speaker did not enable either to develop even a brief argument, the Bacon-Shakspeare controversy must have been brought to the notice of millions who were quite unaware of its existence.

In America there were frequent references on the radio and in the principal newspapers, and the Society prepared an account of the proposed excavations at the request of the Hearst group of newspapers, and this was

cabled to New York over the signatures of the President and Chairman of the Council. On Sunday, the 6th November, by request of the American Broadcasting Corporation, Mr. R. L. Eagle, a member of the Society, gave a short broadcast address to the U.S.A.: with him at the microphone was Professor J. Isaacs, of King's College, London, who spoke from the orthodox Stratford standpoint.

The matter of Spenser's grave has received so much publicity that it may be worth while to recall a curious acrostic "signature," if such it can be called, which some time ago a member of the Bacon Society, Mr. G. C. Cuninghame, discovered in the monument erected to Spenser's memory in Westminster Abbey. The epitaph is as follows: "Heare lyes (expecting the second comminge of our Saviour Christ Jesus) the Body of Edmond Spenser the Prince of Poets in his Tyme whose Divine Spirit needs noe other witnes than the works which he left behind him." Reading backwards from the last "f" to the first "n" this gives "Fr. Bacon."

There is a similar signature to the Shakespeare monument erected in the Abbey in 1740. The quotation from "The Tempest" has been garbled, as Mr. Cuninghame thought in order to give the same running signature "Fr. Bacon." The fourth line of the Folio version was transposed for the seventh line and "a vision" was substituted for "this vision."

There are, of course, very many such "signatures" in the early editions of the Shakespeare Plays and Poems and it is difficult to believe they are all the results of coincidence. They are comprised in and occupy the whole of a complete sentence or verse. The "signature" always begins upon the first letter in the sentence that begins the "signature" and ends upon the last use of the letter in the sentence that ends the "signature." Sometimes the "signature" is written backwards but follows the same rule reversed. Much has been written upon these curiosities and doubtless they will always attract a certain type of mind. It is impossible as yet to reach any final judg-

ment: but the assumption that a number of slight probabilities constitutes a virtual certainty is justified when the probabilities point in the same direction and support one another.

Both Bacon and "Shakespeare" evince an especial interest in Alexander the Great. Hamlet, brooding in the churchyard wonders whether the Emperor's dust might not stop a beer barrel "for Alexander died, Alexander was buried, Alexander returneth into dust: the dust is earth; of earth we make loam and why of that loam whereto he was converted might they not stop a beer barrel?" In the "Meditations of Marcus Aurelius," 6th Book, S.24, the Emperor-Philosopher speculates whether the atoms of which Alexander's body consisted might not have been turned into those of his donkey driver and so we have two, or is it three, great minds thinking alike about Alexander the Great? The Meditations were comparatively unknown in England, and among Shakespeare's fellow dramatists no reference to them can be found. No English translation was made until long after Shakspeare's death and it is difficult to understand how he became acquainted with the Latin Greek edition of 1568.

The influence of the Stoic philosophers upon Shakespeare was very great. It is noticeable in "King Lear." We must endure our going hence, even as our coming hither, Ripeness is all."

This may be another echo of Marcus Aurelius "One must quit life with resignation, just as a ripe olive falls." ("Meditations," IV, 48).

Lecturing to the Bristol Shakespeare Society Professor J. Crofts declared that, with the exception of his birth, his marriage and its issue, we can be certain of nothing of the youth of Shakespeare. For the rest we must create the Man for ourselves. Baconians have, of course, never ceased to point out the folly of embroidering the poor boy theme and of continuing to look at Shakespeare as a Stratford yeoman's son. It may be that we shall now have fewer "biographies" compiled as if by piling one

hypothesis upon another with "if," "apparently," and "probably," facts can be literally created. Doubts, speculations and pure inventions will, however, we fear continue to masquerade as the truth of history and the guessing formulae "might or might not" and our old friends "doubtless" and "must have been," "it is more than likely" and "just think how!" are still with us in recent "imaginative reconstructions" accepted as biographies of Shakespeare.

But what have the Stratfordians left by which they can identify their young Warwickshire protégé with the Shakespeare whose name in another form was first printed as a playwright in 1598, thirteen years after the birth of the twins, the last event of which we can, according to Professor Crofts, be certain?

Only after 1598 were the Shakespeare plays printed otherwise than anonymously and writers who use expressions which perhaps identify player and poet either really believed in that identity or, if they did not, were not themselves deceived. What evidence is there to establish the identity itself, not that some contemporaries may have believed in it?

Professor C. J. Sisson, inaugurating a series of Shakespeare Lectures at Bristol University contended, *pace* Professor Crofts, that the marriage of Shakspeare and Anne Hathaway was an ideally happy one, that he never left her in any real sense: that his home was always in Stratford and that he wrote as a man who knew a happy married life. The more the plays were studied the more evident it became that fidelity to the high Elizabethan standards of love and marriage permeated them. The title of the Professor's lecture was "The Tragedy of Lady Macbeth." The happy Macbeth marriage it appears was broken up after the murder of Duncan; she could find no place in her husband's thoughts and he would not take her into his confidence before slaughtering Banquo, consulting the witches and putting Lady Macduff and the rest to the sword. We think it hardly necessary to express our complete disagreement with this new view of the "Tragedy of

Macbeth," that superb study of "supernatural soliciting," Ambition and Fear; we may hope that we shall hear no more of "Macbeth" and his Queen as being separated after death and exiled from a paradise lost. Such an interpretation of the great Tragedy is indeed novel—we almost wrote novelettish. What is even more remarkable is that Professor Sisson presented a view of Shakspeare's marriage which every particle of such evidence as there is completely falsifies, and a picture of Elizabethan sexual morality which is really a ludicrous one. The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries must not be measured by Shakespeare.

We may refer Professor Sisson to Chapman's "All Fools" (1599), Marston's "Scourge of Villiany" (1599) and Nash's "Summers' Last Will and Testament" published in 1600 as contemporary witnesses to the "Foul, odious sin In which our swinish times be wallowing," and to the plays of Ben Jonson, Peele, Ford and Shakespeare himself, so far as they reflect contemporary life, which all add testimony to the same effect.

We do not forget Bacon's words "Almost all scholars have this: when anything is presented to them they will find in it that which they know, nor learn from it that which they know not."

A STUDY IN ELIZABETHAN TYPOGRAPHY.

By G. B. CURTIS, M.A.

IN two articles appearing in *BACONIANA*,¹ Mr. C. L'Estrange Ewen presents a claim to have discovered that the sonnet by Thomas Lodge set in italics on page A2-verso of *The Spanish Masquerado* (1589) was printed from the same setting of type in the three copies owned by the British Museum whereas Elizabeth Wells Gallup in 1900² had found or assumed two distinct printings of this page. The importance of Mr. Ewen's claim, though of interest bibliographically, concerns primarily the controversy as to the presence of Bacon's typographical cipher³ in books of the period. The purpose of the present paper is to contribute additional facts pertinent to a study of Elizabethan typography and to offer observations leading to conclusions contrary to those of Mr. Ewen.

Following Mr. Ewen's nomenclature, it will be convenient to refer to the British Museum copy of *The Spanish Masquerado* known as the King's Library copy (95.b.18.6) as K, and the Old Library and Grenville copies (1060.h.5.1 and G6157) as OL and G respectively.

Mrs. Gallup, untrained as a research scholar and quite ignorant of the demands of scholarship in the presentation of results, failed to record even in her preserved notes, which copies she made use of. With painstaking and time-consuming effort, Mr. Ewen has shown that the shorter interior writing came from K and the longer either from

¹Vol. XXII, No. 83, pp. 66-77 (Oct. 1935) and Vol. XXII, No. 85, pp. 253-258 (Jan. 1937), hereafter referred to as No. 83 and No. 85 respectively.

²*Bilateral Cipher of Francis Bacon*, Third Edition, Detroit and London, 1901, pp. 94-95, and *Pros and Cons of the Controversy*, Detroit and London, no date, p. 50.

³*De Augmentis Scientiarum*, Liber VI, Caput I.

OL or G.⁴ Mr. Ewen has made a real contribution at this point.⁴ Mr. Ewen has also accurately pointed out that "if any imaginary reading is to be introduced into the transliteration not more than a third of fixed founts can be used" and that any one electing "to manufacture a story would be faced with considerable difficulty if the easily identifiable and unmistakable founts amounted to more than one-third."⁵ Further, he properly comments that "two distinct readings can never be obtained from any one set of Bacon symbols" by shifting the five-letter groupings of the symbols.

Before proceeding to the essential point at issue—the identity or non-identity of the Lodge sonnet in K on the one hand with OL and/or G on the other, two points of general interest must first be cleared up. These are first the questions of supernormal vision and the use of magnifying instruments, and second the problem of differences between printed letters as over against differences between type-faces. Let us examine the latter problem first.

Primarily, if Bacon's cipher was used in printed books, the cipher existed in a difference in the type—in the face of the metal slugs set up by the printer. Before that, presumably, there was a difference in the matrices from which, in the mold, the type-faces received their form. To be sure a cipherer, if he chose, might make use of accidental existing differences which he could classify into two founts—an a-fount and a b-fount, a dot-fount and a dash-fount—to accomplish his purpose. Or perhaps—if

"There are differences between OL and G, possibly resulting from "correction and replacement during the process of printing." These may be sufficient completely to destroy the cipher. It will not do to say Mrs. Gallup "tacitly acknowledged them to be identical, since she used but one of them" (No. 85, pp. 254-5). Whether OL or G or both contain the cipher can be determined only by a competent cryptographer working on the Museum copies and repeating Mrs. Gallup's work.

⁴*Vide* No. 83, pp. 70-73.

⁵While outside the scope of the present paper, for reasons to be developed below, presumably if one half the 250 italic letters in the K sonnet could be assigned definitely and unmistakably to their respective founts, Mr. Ewen would have to accept the validity of Mrs. Gallup's work. He notes (No. 83, p. 69, footnote) that Woodward classified 75 per cent. of the letters in works studied by him.

8 A Study in Elizabethan Typography

the cipher is real—matrices were cut especially for the purpose, using for each letter two, or groups of two or more, uniform differences, such as differences in slope, in serifs, in shading, in angles between parts of letters, in letters as a whole, and the like. This second method, I assume, rather than the first, is more probable. In this case the matrix-cutter knew what he wanted and varied his letters according to the intent of the cipherer.

Here a nice question presents itself. Were the matrices cut by a *counterpunch* as in the nineteenth century or were they cut individually by the buren of an engraver? Before the advent of machine cutting, scrupulously exact in its results, after a letter was designed, it was transferred to a punch. The letter on this steel punch was embossed as a positive, not engraved (as in a matrix) as a negative. This counterpunch was then hardened and driven into the softer steel of the matrix and transferred its image thereto. The matrix was placed in the mold, the type-metal poured in and the resulting slug produced with a type-face identical with that of the counterpunch. Many matrices would result from a single counterpunch. A close examination of many letters in Elizabethan printing has led me to the tentative conclusion that much English type of the Elizabethan era was cast in individually cut matrices and not from matrices made with a counterpunch. T. B. Reed's monumental work on early English typefounders is silent on this point and in fact throws little light on the subject of the typefounders of this period. It is a subject requiring further investigation and study.

But, having acquired two founts of type with the necessary differences between individual characters, or groups of individual characters, the special characteristics did not necessarily transfer themselves distinctly to the printed page.

The process of printing involves covering the type-face with ink, by means of a roller. The paper is then squeezed between the "press" and the type, and picks up the ink. In the process, ink will be forced off the face of the type and this surplus ink will be absorbed by the paper. It is essential to note however that the surplus ink will be

absorbed by the paper outside the limits of the outline of the type-face. This surplus ink will produce a printed letter somewhat different from the type-face and each printing will be slightly different from every other. This is true of modern printing as well as of sixteenth and seventeenth century work, but not so noticeably because of the nice adjustment of modern rollers.

Fortunately, by the use of a reading glass the surplus ink can be differentiated from the ink which was deposited by the type-face itself. Under the glass the former is intensely black, while the latter is grayish. Obviously the special characteristics of a letter are to be seen in this grayish area, and the outside ink must be ignored. A pocket magnifier—being stronger—will assist the beginner in identifying this phenomenon, but an adequate reading glass and proper illumination are sufficient. Only by studying printed letters in this manner can one know the exact outline of the type-face which produced the printed letter. The expert can frequently reconstruct the type-face in his mind by ignoring globules of ink on the side, the “ink-traps” of certain letters, and the distortions which commonly repeat themselves; but the inexperienced must proceed with caution in passing judgment as to similarity or dissimilarity of letters not examined in the original printing with the aid of a glass.

The foregoing phenomenon is an observation of my own, and seems to be unknown to bibliographers. I have never anywhere seen this discovery mentioned but I venture the *a priori* assumption that typographers and photomicrographers are thoroughly familiar with what I have here described. No doubt Mrs. Gallup depended heavily on this phenomenon in her study of Elizabethan printing. I have seen many erroneous bibliographical statements, incorrect because their authors were ignorant of the foregoing fundamental fact. Its importance can scarcely be overestimated. The reader may observe it in the *L* in the enlargement of *Le doux* of OL, line 1, Plate III. (In this and all plates the word at the top or left is from K, the other from OL.)

It follows that an ordinary photograph which pictures

10 A Study in Elizabethan Typography

the ink from the type-outline itself and the excess ink alike in an even blackness, destroys what can be seen by the eye in studying the original. Hence photographic or photostatic reproductions are practically useless in *careful* collation of two pieces of printing, particularly if the question of a typographical cipher is involved. Furthermore the photographic reproducing processes not only do not reproduce the variations in density of ink but are apt to impose new variations of their own on the plate. The letters on the plate in turn may themselves be subject to distortion from an overflow of ink on the newly printed page. For future scientific work involving reproduction and a record of what the eye has seen, the solution of the problem seems to be sufficient enlargement and accurate photographic exposure to catch what the normal (or, if the reader prefers, the supernormal) eye has seen with the aid of a reading glass.⁷ Original editions must obviously be used inasmuch as reproductions are subject to the severe limitation that they do not portray accurately the details of the type-face itself.

Typesetters of experience at handset type, using the naked eye, find it easier to distinguish type of different founts than to distinguish the printed impressions of the same type. The reason for this is the obvious absence of distortion arising from the excess of ink absorbed by the paper outside the outline of the type-face.

Every well equipped printing office of the present day has a so-called microscope, consisting of a single lens, similar to that in a reading glass, set in a frame which holds the lens a proper focal distance from the paper or type. It receives constant use. The cutters of matrices for modern type-setting are equipped with binocular compound microscopes. That the Elizabethans did not have the latter is patent, but that simple magnifying lenses were unknown to the engravers of the time appears to be absurd. Galileo, it will be recalled, born the same year as

⁷The first photomicrographs of printed letters taken for demonstrating and recording differences in type-faces for bibliographical or cryptographical purposes, so far as I know, were taken by myself in August, 1937. It is unfortunate the Riverbank Laboratories did not hit upon this device during Mrs. Gallup's active years.

A Study in Elizabethan Typography 11

Marlowe and Shakspeare, was looking at sunspots with a compound telescope at this period. That workers on the matrices, the type, and the proof of Elizabethan printing should have magnifying glasses equal to our reading glasses or the magnifiers used by watch makers—all that is necessary—would, in the absence of definite evidence to the contrary, appear to be reasonable. In fact one cannot comprehend how the engraving and type-cutting accomplished during the period could have been done otherwise.

The problem of perception, supernormal, normal, or subnormal, and of perfect human sight is surprisingly a serious one. Journeyman printers (workers at setting 'job-type') can distinguish the fount—Garamond, Bodoni, Caslon, Goudy, etc.—of a piece of type with alacrity, when the layman can see no difference at all. They can readily distinguish 6 pt. from 7 pt., and 11 pt. from 12 pt. Furthermore they can distinguish a $\frac{1}{3}$ -quad from a $\frac{1}{4}$ -quad without resort to instruments. In the pica (12 pt.) size, this means they can tell $\frac{4}{72}$ of an inch from $\frac{3}{72}$ of an inch, or a difference of .0138 inches. Those who can do it for 6 pt. type distinguish .0069 inches. I think we do not say that their "sight" is better than that of others but rather that their perception has been trained. "Sight" can be perfect though the perception is extremely deficient. Sight likewise can be corrected by an oculist so that vision is perfect. Perception however has to be developed by training.

My colleagues in psychology tell me that the perceptive powers of most individuals are exceedingly low. My wife, formerly a member of the faculty of Hunter College, has told me of the great difficulties her students normally had in beginning to study material under the microscope. Perception seems to be partly a matter of training and experience, a faculty that can be developed. But I judge there is also something more. Just as some piano students never acquire the skill of a great master, so some will never acquire the ability to distinguish minutiae. The development of perceptive powers—even with "sight" which tests perfectly—will differ with individuals. The fundamental problem here, then, is the selection of persons with

12 A Study in Elizabethan Typography

adequately trained perceptive powers and in addition an acute understanding of the other matters involved.

One of the tests upon Mrs. Gallup by James Phinney Baxter⁸ furnishes a splendid illustration of what untrained beginners can do. I have myself worked out the sonnets set up by Baxter, without reference to the bi-formed alphabets published by him. Fearing that some day I might be accused of "subliminal storage,"⁹ I have undertaken to see what others with a complete ignorance of the material could do in attacking the problem. Several years ago I photographed each of the Baxter sonnets down to lantern-slide size. The Baxter reproduction is about 16 point in size and my reproduction about 8 1/2 point.¹⁰ After ten or fifteen minutes explanation as to the method of Bacon's cipher and the proper procedure for "breaking" it, these photographs, together with Bacon's "dot-and-dash" code, were handed independently to three individuals,—the only three who have been willing to try the experiment. The individuals were Olive Mills, Genevieve Giering (both members of the Lehigh University secretarial staff), and Catherine Barlieb. The first two are college graduates under thirty years of age, the last a normal school graduate over forty-five. Miss Mills and Miss Giering exchanged observations as to differences in letters, the first word to "come out," etc.; Mrs. Barlieb worked absolutely independently. None of these individuals knew, nor yet knows, the source of the photographs or had the enlarged key alphabets. Each studied out the differences in the letters (using only an ordinary reading glass for magnification), classified them by count as a-fount or b-fount, and worked through to a complete solution.

"In view of the changes which take place in photographic reproduction," writes Mr. Ewen,¹¹ Mrs. Gallup's "feat

⁸*The greatest of literary problems*, Boston, 1915 and 1917, pp. 539-544.

⁹No. 85, p. 258.

¹⁰Since the ascenders and descenders of these letters are unusually long, the letter body is correspondingly smaller,—about the size of 6 pt. letter bodies in modern type.

¹¹No. 83, pp. 257-8.

was certainly remarkable." Recalling that Mrs. Gallup with a previous familiarity with this type worked on a photographic reduction of Mr. Baxter's enlarged type, and that the three women named above worked on a reduced photograph of the photolithograph or line-cut reproduced on the rough paper of Baxter's book, their feat is perhaps the more remarkable. Furthermore, they did this without previous experience with this cipher and without training in typography. In other words, these people have decoded "a message from type, the minute distinctions of which have been secretly classified by someone else," a feat much more difficult than Mrs. Gallup's.¹²

Mr. Ewen concedes that he cannot decode the Baxter passages even with the biformed alphabet before him.¹³ Obviously therefore he is not a competent critic of Mrs. Gallup's work nor, more to the present purpose, sufficiently expert in this branch of typography to pass judgment on the identity of type in the separate printings of the Thomas Lodge sonnet here under consideration. These individuals would scarcely be said to have "supernormal vision," rather Mr. Ewen's is subnormal.

Yet, I must note that this feat does not prove the contention that Bacon's typographical cipher is to be found in books published between 1579 and 1685. In this test passage all a-fount letters, a, b, c, d, e, f, etc., are practically identical with each other. So with the b-fount letters. This is a bi-formed alphabet. The problem with

¹²The photo-engraving of the I. M. poem is much more difficult than the photograph, of which I have a photograph, on which Mrs. Gallup worked. The reproduction fails to record what Baxter sent Mrs. Gallup or what she saw; it has lost many of the minute differences. Furthermore Baxter's bi-formed alphabet does not enlighten the reader as to the characteristics which the many (or multi-formed) a-fount *a*'s, b-fount *a*'s, a-fount *b*'s, b-fount *b*'s, a-fount *e*'s, b-fount *e*'s, etc., used by him have in common. It is naive to suggest Baxter told Mrs. Gallup he used First Folio type, when the first line and last two lines of his piece are so obviously identical with the First Folio, letter by letter. All Mrs. Gallup had to do was note the transposition of the letters within the passage,—a task not very difficult for her or for any one thoroughly familiar with her solution of the original poem.

¹³No. 85, p. 258 footnote.

14 A Study in Elizabethan Typography

the Elizabethan books is to show that the multi-formed a's, the multi-formed b's, the multi-formed c's, the multi-formed d's, etc., can be classified into two founts. Mrs. Gallup never tried to demonstrate, in print, for a single passage of even 100 letters why each successive letter belonged to its particular fount. Accordingly her work, even though almost certainly correct, remains unrecognized and awaits a rediscoverer with greater facility in demonstration and exposition.

Let us turn now to an examination of the disputed Lodge sonnets themselves. Directly after the publication of Mr. Ewen's first paper, I requested the late editor of *BACONIANA*, Mr. Henry Seymour, to secure for me direct enlargements (three diameter, nine times, enlargement) 8×10 inches in size, of the Lodge sonnet in each of the three copies in the British Museum. I hoped that the three-diameter enlargement would "bring out" the outline of the type-faces as discussed above. Apparently Mr. Seymour did not appreciate the importance of my request, for he replied my request was not feasible. Instead he sent me contact prints from the negatives made at the Museum which formed the basis of the published reproductions. From K and OL thus supplied me, I made an 8×10 enlarged copy,—increasing the 12 point type of the original to 36 point. From these negatives 12-diameter and 20-diameter enlargements by projection were made for study. Because of a lack of sharpness, these proved unsatisfactory for reproduction and accordingly new photographs, matching my working copies, were taken on October 20, 1938, by the British Museum photographers, in the presence of Mr. B. G. Theobald, President of the Bacon Society. It is from these photographs that the plates accompanying this paper were made. The enlargements help materially in the study and discussion of individual parts of letters, but lack the detail of correctly exposed photomicrographs which show the shades of black visible to the eye when examining the letters under a lens.

Before securing these, however, I had carefully examined the published reproductions of the three copies. It quickly became apparent that letters which Mr. Ewen's

A Study in Elizabethan Typography 15

transliteration of the cipher indicated should be different were indeed alike, and that letters required by this transliteration to be alike actually came from different founts. Had Mr. Ewen correctly transliterated the two passages? Assuming Mrs. Gallup used OL and not G (an assumption convenient but not altogether warranted), did he assign the a-symbols and b-symbols to the letters of OL correctly? Quite obviously either K or OL or both were transliterated incorrectly and a shift to the right or left of one or both transliterations might set the matter right.

It should be courteously observed here that the transliteration published in *BACONIANA*, although ascribed to Mrs. Gallup, is Ewen's transliteration, not Mrs. Gallup's. Though he frequently makes assertions such as "Mrs. Gallup read *a* in K and *b* in OL and G," actually he more carefully should have stated "under my assumption as to the correctness of my transliteration, Mrs. Gallup" did thus and so. Actually she read quite otherwise.

Were there, perhaps, "errors" in ciphering on page A2 (four or six letter groups) which would cause a shifting of the transliteration? Or perhaps have letters such as signatures and catchwords been included, which if omitted, would bring reasonableness out of apparent chaos? The *A* and the *TO* at the bottom of A2 in OL (and G) most obviously were possible offending interlopers. Nowhere, I think, are signatures and catchwords in italic included in the coded passages. In some books the headings are included and in others omitted. Which is the case here? These and similar questions must be answered before attempting to assert what Mrs. Gallup did or did not do or claim. Though confident the omission of *ATO* in OL produced the proper result, I did not wish to pass judgment on Mrs. Gallup (it is too easy for wrong groupings to creep in) until I had secured Mrs. Gallup's own transliteration. Colonel Fabyan very kindly provided this for me about a year before his death. Mrs. Gallup's own transliteration is given below (there are no wrong groupings and the *ATO* of A2 in OL are omitted). For ready comparison, the transliterations are set in juxtaposition and the five letter groupings are shown by alternating roman and

16 A Study in Elizabethan Typography

italic groups. The internal message may be worked out or reference made to Mr. Ewen's article.¹⁴ Mrs. Gallup's transliteration is as follows:

Le doux Babil de ma lire d'iuoire
 K *ab aa aabb aaaab ba ba abaa a aaaaba*
 OL *ab babb aaaba aa aa babb a babaaa*

Serra ton front d'un laurier verdissant
 K *baaab aaa bbaba a ba bbaabab aaaaabbab*
 OL *baaaa bab aabab a aa aabaaba aabbaaaaa*

Dont a bon droit ie te voy iouissant
 K *abaa a aab aaaba ba aa aaa baabaaaba*
 OL *aaab a bba aabba aa aa aaa baabaaaba*

(Mon doux ami) eternisant ta gloire
 K *aab abab abb ababaabaaa aa baaaba*
 OL *aab baab aba abbbaaaaaa aa baabaa*

Ton nom (mon Greene) anime par mes vers
 K *aba baa baa abaaaab baaba aba abb abab*
 OL *aaa baa aaa abaabb baaaab aab aab aaab*

Abaisse l'oeil de gens seditieux,
 K *abbaaaa a abaa ba abaa aaaaaabbb*
 OL *aabaaba a bbaa ba abaa aaaaaaab*

Tu de mortel es compagnon de Dieux:
 K *aa ba aaaaba aa aabaaabaa ba aabba*
 OL *ab aa bababa aa aabaaabaa bb aabaa*

N'est ce point grand loyer dans l'univers?
 K *a bba ba aabaa baaab aaaaa bbba a baabbab*
 OL *a bba ab aaaaa bbaba aabaa baab a abaabaa*

Ignoti nulla cupido
 K *abbabb aabbb aaaaba aba*
 OL *abbabb aaaba abaaba*

It will be observed that the omission of *A* and *TO*

¹⁴No. 83, p. 73.

(signature and catchword) at the bottom of page A2, OL edition, causes Mr. Ewen's transliteration to shift three places to the left. The text of the sonnet moves to the right as placed above Mr. Ewen's transliteration. It may be added that the catchword *TO*, on page A2, applies to the phrase "*To the Gentlemen Readers,*" on page A3, and not, as would be expected, to anything on page A2-verso. The Lodge sonnet is the sole printing on page A2-verso. In K the catchword *TO* appears in roman type; in OL and G in italic type. So also with the signature letter.

In Mrs. Gallup's transliteration there are 84 differences of fount (as between K and OL) in the 250 letters in the sonnet, whereas in Mr. Ewen's assumed transliteration there are 113 for the whole sonnet. This difference arises simply from shifting the Ewen transliteration of OL three places to the left. In order, by lines, these differences in fount as between the two editions are 13, 20, 7, 7, 9, 5, 6, 14, and 3.

How were these changes of type, if present, brought about? Was the type redistributed and reset? Were the 84 unwanted letters pulled and replaced? Or was the old setting left on the stone and the new built in the stick, using the letters from the old printing as they happened to coincide with the needs of the new? The broken "a" of *Babil* (line 1) in K and the still more broken "a" of *Babil* in OL, the clipped "o" of *voy* in K and the same clipping in OL, and the broken "u" in *Mon doux* (line 4) in both K and OL certainly seem to indicate retention of these particular pieces of type in the second edition. It should be possible to determine priority of editions in this manner.

In my own work, in making similar changes, I have left the type standing, pulled and distributed the unwanted letters, and reinserted letters of the correct fount. Because many a-fount letters used at the same point in K and OL have also been changed, it seems to me more likely that the old printing was left on the stone and the new edition set in the stick, some type and the quads from the old edition having been used. I do not know that it much matters.

18 A Study in Elizabethan Typography

It may be observed that except in lines 1, 2, and 8 relatively few letters need to be altered to produce the new interior writing.

Examination and description of the 84 letters differing or allegedly differing in the two editions requires time, patience, and space enough for a small book. Just how many must be demonstrated to be different to establish the lack of identity of the two printings will vary from reader to reader. A truly thorough treatise would take up each of the 500 letters involved and explain why it is a-fount or b-fount. That is a task for a second Mrs. Gallup. Attention can here be directed only to a few. Selected words containing one or more of the 84 letters under question have been enlarged and reproduced. The reader will have to study all but the few here mentioned for himself.

Let us examine the four (or more accurately eight) *i*'s cited by Mr. Ewen.¹⁶ Two pairs of these, No. 3 in line 6 (first in *seditieux*) and No. 2 in line 8 (*uniuers*) are a-fount in both editions. In other words, these four are all a-fount. Any argument as to their having a small dot or no dot is therefore irrelevant. No. 1 in line 4 (*ami*) is b-fount in K and a-fount in OL. Though, as Mr. Ewen points out, both have small dots, they are quite different (see Plates IX and XVII). The top serif of the *i* in K if extended downward to the line of printing will make a more acute angle than will a corresponding extension of the serif of the OL *i*. The serif of the OL *i* is more vertical. In other words, the serif of the OL *i* is closer to the stem than is that of K. The two serifs of K extended are parallel and will not intersect; those of OL extended will intersect below the line of printing. The K *i* (b-fount) has an angularity about it whereas the OL *i* (a-fount) has a roundness at the junctions of the serifs and the stem. The fourth pair of *i*'s is the No. 1 *i* in line 1 (*Babil*). These are not so sharply differentiated as those in *ami*. The K *i* has

¹⁶No. 85, p.255. In view of the argument from coincidence at this point in Mr. Ewen's paper, one ventures to suggest that on the basis of "coincidence" Mrs. Gallup's work has been "proven" by many examiners.

A Study in Elizabethan Typography 19

the roundness, but is a-fount; the OL *i* is decidedly angular, but is b-fount (Plate xvii). This is the reverse of the fount characteristics of the *i*'s in *ami*, and is to be expected because of the absence of dots on these *i*'s. What other factors cause letters to be "marked or accented letters" and therefore reversed in fount Mrs. Gallup never explained. Presumably the position of the dot over the *i*, directly above or to the left as in *Dieux* (line 7) is important. The kind of twist to be seen in the top serif of the *i* in *verdisant* (line 2) is likewise not to be ignored as insignificant (Plate xvi). Other *i*'s from different founts such as the first in *inoire* (line 1) and that in *gloire* (line 4) may be readily studied by the reader for himself (Plates iv and viii).

The second *e* in *Greene* (see Plates I, II, and X) is a-fount¹⁰ in both K and OL, but they are not the same type-faces. That of OL is narrower and taller; the curve of the final stroke has a shorter radius; its loop is smaller and has a more sloping long diameter; the lower part of the loop joins the main body of the letter at a higher point. The *n* of this word is different, too, K being a-fount and OL b-fount. The chief difference is in the bend at the bottom of the first stem,—a difference noted as significant by Mrs. Gallup.¹¹

In *Mon doux*, two, not six, of the seven letters have been changed. They are *do*. See Plate IX. The final serif of the *d* is close in OL and open in K; the stem is different at the top; and the point of junction of the loop is lower in OL than in K. The junction of the top of the loop with the stem is blotted; examination of the original will probably show a more acute angle at this point in OL. The *u* is a-fount in both editions.

In *verdisant* (line 2), as shown in Plates VII and XVI, the *a*'s do differ, though both are below the *n*. The serif of K sweeps around, starts upward on a slant (the printed letter is deformed by the ink in the ink-trap of this kind of serif); the serif of OL is merely a "tick" added at the bottom of the stem. K as well has a taller stem and a

¹⁰Ewen wrongly assumes one to be a-fount and the other b-fount and asserts them to be identical.

¹¹*Pros and Cons of the Controversy*, p. 141.

20 A Study in Elizabethan Typography

longer loop; furthermore it has more inclination from the vertical. In the long *f*, we have a characteristic a-fount and b-fount letter. In OL the letter is taller and bends around at the top in a curve of short radius. In K the stroke of the top has a curve of long radius and appears flat. The OL letter, too, begins to increase its slope just above the top line of the letter bodies, while K continues straight upward until the final curve begins. The *f* in *front* (line 2), Plate VI, is a similar letter. In K both *f* and *f* are b-fount, and in OL both are a-fount,—the corresponding curvatures are significant for the respective founts.

The *a* in *laurier* (line 2), Plate VI, is distinctly different. To be sure OL is broken but it never had that peculiar horizontal turn in the finish of the loop where it joins the stem, that can be seen in K. This K letter shows the importance of examining original copy and may be cited as illustrating the improbability that the matrix was made with a counterpunch.

The *c* in *ce* (line 8), Plate XI, was obviously not printed from the same type in the two editions. In the OL *c* the final stroke points nearly vertical, whereas the K *c* points outward. The "back" of the OL letter has more curve (a shorter radius) and the K *c* is flatter. In *bon* (line 3), Plate VIII, are characteristic *b*'s. In OL the angle of the stem and the longest diameter of the loop is smaller than in the K letter; in other words, in OL the loop is closer to the stem. In the same word, *n* has differing connecting strokes. The point of junction with the first stem is higher in OL than in K; this produces greater slope in the connecting line of OL than in that of K.

Finally, let us examine a few *e*'s. The final stroke of the *e* in *Le doux* (line 1), Plate III, in K if extended would intersect the loop well at the left but in OL (even disregarding the blot within the curve)¹⁸ the stroke extended would pass to the right of the loop. The long diameter of the loop of the *e* in K is more vertical (has less slope) than that of OL. OL has more slope. Similar differences in

¹⁸The photograph (enlargement) before me shows this blot and the type-face outline, but the photo-engraving does not reproduce this.

A Study in Elizabethan Typography 21

loop and/or final stroke are to be seen in *lire* (line 1), *laurier* (line 2), *gloire* (line 4), and *anime* (line 5), (Plates IV, VI, VIII and XI), though not all are from opposite founts.

In Plate XV are shown the *li* and *la* of *lire* and *laurier*, the letters on the left being from K and those on the right from OL. The magnification, like Plate XVI, is 20 diameters, 400 times. In *lire* the K *l* and the OL *l* are particularly characteristic and easy to distinguish. The *l* of K has a final stroke (serif) which is angular; that of OL is rounded, the curvature beginning at the bottom of the stem. In *laurier* the K *l* has the rounded serif and the OL *l* the angular serif, but these letters are not so characteristically differentiated. Obviously, however, they were not printed from identical pieces of type.

Other of the 84 letters allegedly differing between the two editions are shown in the enlargements reproduced in the plates and may be examined by the reader with "normal" sight. I am confident such a reader will find enough differences to convince him that the two editions were not printed from exactly the same type throughout.

By way of summing up, then, this paper has shown that the study of Elizabethan types requires the use of a reading glass to distinguish the form of the type-face from the ink of the printed letter, that photomicrographs are necessary to record and demonstrate the true form of a type-face as seen by the eye, that "normal" perception, particularly if trained, enables individuals to note minute distinctions not perceptible to subnormal vision or perception, that the transliteration of the Lodge sonnets as previously published is incorrect, and that differences between the letters of the Lodge sonnet in the King's Library copy and those in the Old Library copy do exist and fit the requirements of Mrs. Gallup's transliteration. We conclude that it would be well worth while to proceed further with a study of the question whether the italic type in certain Elizabethan books was arranged in accordance with Bacon's typographical cipher for the purpose of conveying to posterity suppressed history of Elizabeth's reign or for other purposes.

THE SEARCH FOR SPENSER'S TOMB

ALTHOUGH the coffin containing the remains of Edmund Spenser has not been identified, and its location is still uncertain, our readers will be interested to hear from eye-witnesses what actually took place in Westminster Abbey. The following account is therefore given by the three representatives of the Bacon Society who were present, namely, Mr. Bertram G. Theobald, President; Mr. Valentine Smith, Chairman of Council; and Mr. R. L. Eagle, a member of the Council, who originated the proposal to open this grave.

The Society first approached the Dean of Westminster, Dr. Paul de Labilliere, on 4th March 1938; and after some correspondence, in the course of which letters from representative literary men and women approving the scheme were shown to him, he agreed to consider the proposal, one of his stipulations being that the coffin, if found, should not be disturbed.

On 4th October the Dean wrote saying that owing to the European crisis his staff had been disorganised and were fully engaged in other duties. He feared therefore that the opening must be postponed indefinitely. But he added, "we had started to open Spenser's tomb, and though we had not completely uncovered the coffin I think that we now have reason to believe that any further search would be quite fruitless. However, I could discuss the matter with you at a later date." To this the Society replied on 7th October expressing surprise at the Dean's action in going so far as to uncover the coffin partially, without inviting the Society's nominees to be present, as agreed. They asked who had been in attendance, what precautions had been taken to prevent unauthorised persons from gaining access, and so forth. They concluded by hoping that the search would be continued.

On 21st October the Dean wrote saying that he was prepared to sanction the opening, but did not wish to disclose the exact date, in order to avoid Press publicity;

The Search for Spenser's Tomb. 23

but he promised to give forty-eight hours' notice to the Society's three representatives. It appeared subsequently that flagstones had been removed in order that digging might commence in front of the Spenser wall monument. But it was soon discovered that the ground consisted of almost solid masonry for some distance, this being in fact the Abbey foundations and probably marking the site of the ancient Edward the Confessor Chapter House. It was not until tests had been made for some fourteen feet away from the monument that comparatively loose earth was found. For this reason the preliminary examination had been made here, and a coffin located. But the earth had been replaced before the formal opening took place.

At 2 p.m. on 2nd November the proceedings commenced, and they were resumed on the following day, continuing until about 4 o'clock, with an interval for lunch. Those present were as follows: On 2nd November, The Dean of Westminster, the Arch-Deacon, Canon Marriott, Sir Charles Peers, Surveyor to the Abbey, Mr. Lawrence Tanner, Librarian and Keeper of the Muniments, Canon Donaldson, Hon. Treasurer; R. P. Hargrave-Graham, Hon. Photographer to the Abbey; W. Bishop, Clerk of the Works; the Duke of Rutland; Dr. H. J. Plenderleith, Head of the Research Laboratory at the British Museum; F. C. Wellstood, Secretary and Librarian to the Trustees of the Shakespeare Birthplace; Dr. D. Hamer, Senior Lecturer at the University of Sheffield; P. J. Spenser Tiddeman, a direct descendant of Edmund Spenser, Bertram G. Theobald, President of the Bacon Society; Valentine Smith, Chairman of Council; R. L. Eagle, Member of the Council, three workmen of the Abbey. On 3rd November at 10-45 a.m., The Dean, Canon Donaldson, Canon Marriott, Sir Charles Peers, Lawrence Tanner, W. Bishop, Duke of Rutland, F. C. Wellstood, P. J. Spenser Tiddeman, R. P. Howgrave-Graham, B. G. Theobald, Valentine Smith, R. L. Eagle.

The soil was exceptionally dry, somewhat sandy in nature, with an admixture of stones. Preliminary digging was done, partly by a workman under the superintendence of Sir Charles Peers and partly by Prof. Plenderleith.

24 The Search for Spenser's Tomb.

All the earth was carefully sifted and examined in case anything of interest should be seen. Before reaching any coffin a number of human bones came to light, lying loose in the earth and in disorder. A well preserved skull was found near the foot of the grave, and the lower jaw of this skull near the head. This proved to be the remains of a young man under thirty years of age, since the wisdom teeth were not fully developed. Another skull was found, probably of an older man. These were considered to be earlier interments, presumably without any solid coffin, and the bones must have been disturbed when the present coffin was placed in this grave. A few tiny fragments of glass were also discovered.

When the coffin was at length disclosed the lid was carefully brushed in order to ascertain whether any identification marks could be seen, but nothing was found. It then became apparent that an outer wooden casing originally enclosed the leaden coffin. This casing had crumbled almost entirely to pieces, but with care it was possible to remove a few fragments intact. When the entire coffin had been freed from the surrounding earth, it was hoisted above ground and the under side examined, in case any marks might be visible. But again nothing was found. There were traces of an inner wooden lining and also fragments of some kind of wrapping.

It may be well to record that the dimensions of the grave were 7ft. 6in. long, 2ft. 9in. wide; and 3ft. 8in. deep. The coffin was 6ft. 4in. long, width at shoulder 1ft. 11½in., width at head 11¾in., width at foot 10 in., length from head to shoulders 1 ft. 11in., depth 13 ¼in., all these being outside measurements.

The most important clues discovered during the operations were the metal handles formerly attached to the coffin and a large number of metal studs originally on the outside. These were considered to be probably of 18th century design, in which case the coffin could not be that of Spenser. Another reason for thinking that it was of later date is the fact that the grave must have been hewn out of almost solid masonry foundations, with great labour; which suggests that by then the Abbey burials had

The Search for Spenser's Tomb. 25

become so numerous that no loose earth could be found near this spot.

One of the most interesting facts about this excavation was that when the coffin was uncovered, the leaden lid was seen to have been deliberately cut in more than one place, and then torn all along one side, so that it was slanting downwards on to the base of the coffin. Thus the skeleton beneath was pushed to one side. The lid was raised sufficiently to view these remains and was then closed again. No clues were discovered. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the tomb must have been rifled before it was completely buried, probably to steal rings or other jewellery from the corpse.

Seeing that the Poet's Corner contains so many wall monuments, it seems improbable that all the bodies relating to these can be buried near by. For example, there is a plaque of Ben Jonson here, whereas his body is said to be interred in the nave. The coffin recently opened is nearly opposite the monument of Michael Drayton; but he died in 1631, not in the 18th century. It is also nearly opposite, on the other side, to the memorial of Matthew Prior, who died in 1721. This date therefore would accord with the evidence of the handles; and as Prior expressed to Dean Atterbury, then Dean of Westminster, the wish that his body might be buried at the feet of Spenser, there seems every reason for concluding that it was Matthew Prior's tomb which was unearthed.

Camden says that Spenser was buried "near Chaucer," which would be a considerable distance away; and as there are many modern burials in that part of the Abbey, Dean de Labilliere does not feel justified in making further search for Spenser's tomb. Since no trace of any pens or fragments of elegies were discovered—and naturally so, since it was not Spenser's tomb—we are still unable either to confirm or to reject Camden's account of this funeral. And so the mystery remains unsolved.

It was suggested by Sir Charles Peers that a small stone tablet should be placed inside this grave, near the surface, recording that it was opened on 2nd and 3rd November, 1938, in a search for the tomb of Edmund Spenser.

THE SPENSER MYSTERY

THE mystery which envelops the life and death of Edmund Spenser seems to surround his burial, for recent excavations in Westminster Abbey have failed to discover the coffin in which he is said to have been interred.

Camden's circumstantial account of the funeral therefore remains uncorroborated and it is unlikely now that it will ever be otherwise. The Annals (1615-1625) are of course the authority both for our belief that Spenser was buried in Westminster Abbey at the charge of Essex, and that mourning elegies with the pens that wrote them were cast by contemporary poets into the grave.

The story as far as it relates to Essex is curious, for he could only have been twelve years of age when Spenser went to Ireland and, as Mr. R. L. Eagle wrote (*BACONIANA*, July, 1938) Essex could have known little or nothing of Spenser personally, nor can it be shown that the Earl was particularly interested in poets or poetry.

Who was Edmund Spenser? Little is known of his life. His biography has, like Shakspeare's, been constructed mainly out of inferences drawn from the poems ascribed to him and, when the external sources of information present difficulties, they are discarded for what is accepted arbitrarily as "internal evidence."

The date and place of his birth have not been traced. The names of his parents are also unknown—his father was supposed to be John Spenser, a journeyman tailor, and his own identity has not been established. Spenser or Spencer (the correct spelling has been much debated) was of course not an uncommon name; but it is curious, though not incredible, that there should have been two Edmund Spenser's at the time. It is clear however that the Spenser who carried despatches in 1569 could not have been the Spenser who was at the Merchant Taylors' School during

part of that year as a "poor scholler." (Edmund Spenser and the Impersonations of Francis Bacon," by E. G. Harman, C.B.)

Again Ben Jonson scarcely ever mentions Spenser whom the unknown editor of the 1679 Folio extols in terms strongly reminiscent of Jonson's own magnificent panegyric of Bacon "He (Spenser) excelled all other Ancient and Modern Poets in Greatness of sense, Decency of expression, Height of Imagination, Quickness of Conceit, Grandeur and Majesty of Thought and all the glories of Verse . . . He was, in a word, completely happy in everything that might render him Glorious and inimitable to future ages." Yet Jonson in his list of the great Lights of Queen Elizabeth's reign entirely ignores this "man of extraordinary accomplishments, skilled in all parts of Learning: of a profound art, copious invention and solid judgment." Jonson's attitude, however, to the poets and dramatists of the Elizabethan age is an enigma.

The mystery surrounding the appearance of the Spenser poems is equally impressive. During the time they were being published Spenser was resident in Ireland. The five editions of the "Shepherds Calendar" were all published anonymously between 1579 and 1597 and Spenser's name was in no way associated with it. But the "Faerie Queene" (1590) and other minor poems appeared with his name as the author during his lifetime. It is the stranger therefore that the "Calendar" was, until 1611 when it was included in the First Folio edition of Spenser's Works (1611), thirteen years after his death, thought to be the work of an unknown poet. Its anonymity was recognised in 1589 in the "Arte of English Poesie." George Whetstone appears to have thought it to be the work of Sir Philip Sidney.

In 1591 a collection of poems dedicated to various ladies of the Queen's Court appeared. Considering that Spenser was in Ireland, which at that time was about as far as Jamaica measured by travelling days now, it seems strange that he should have been acquainted with Lady Compton, the Countess of Pembroke, Lady Carey and the rest. No correspondence is known to have existed between them.

The same volume contains a poem entitled "Virgil's Gnat," dedicated to the Earl of Leicester who had died in 1588. The poet complains the Earl has wronged him, but he dare not express his pain. Of what had Spenser to complain against Leicester, Leicester who was in his grave and Spenser who was in Ireland successfully pursuing a political career there?

Two folio editions published in 1611 and 1617 without preface or editor's name, preceded the 1679 folio which deepens the mystery, for in place of the fantastically garbed shepherd and his companion which adorned the two earlier folios there is an unattractive engraving of the monumental tablet in Westminster Abbey.

This frontispiece appears quite an unsuitable one to such a book as Spenser's, whose subjects were neither Death nor the Grave. Eighty years had passed since Spenser's own death, so that there could have been no question of this Third Folio being a Memorial Edition of his collected works; but, if the character of the picture is surprising, the reproduction of the epitaph which can be clearly read is still more so for, according to this, Spenser was born in 1510 and died in 1596.

These dates cannot be reconciled with any orthodox biography of the poet's life. He could not have been a young man in 1579 writing love songs and sonnets for, if born in 1510, he would have been sixty-nine. At nearly seventy a man has sung his love songs and has passed the long littleness of life; yet this seems to have excited no comment, for in the short account of Spenser's life in the 1679 folio the writer accepts and even emphasises the incongruous birth date. The picture of the tablet was inserted seemingly to prevent the contention that the statement in the biography that Spenser was born in London (as his epitaph says) in the year of Our Lord, 1510 was a printer's error.

A survey of the Abbey Church of St. Peter's, Westminster, was made in 1723 by John Dart and the result of this was published in two volumes illustrated with engravings showing the principal tombs and memorial tablets. Among these is one of the Spenser tablet, and the epitaph

may be clearly read, as in the case of the frontispiece of the 1679 Folio: with this it is identical in respect of arrangement of lines, spelling and dates.

There is also an account of the tablet and epitaph: that the latter was ever placed on the monument at all Dart says is doubtful, "but what," he proceeds, "has raised the chief dispute concerning the epitaph is the date of Mr. Spencer's birth, which upon the tomb was said to be in 1510."

In a Latin-English version of the "Shepherd's Calendar", first published in 1653 and re-published in 1732 by John Ball there is a short life of Spenser. "That he was born in 1510 is in no way consistent with truth," writes Ball after quoting the epitaph.

In BACONIANA, Vol. xi, 3rd series, No. 43, the late Mr. G. C. Cuninghame referred to another 17th century writer who recorded Spenser's monumental tablet. This was Thomas Dingley who decorated his "History of Marble" with pen and ink sketches of various memorials in the churches of England and Wales. The History was never published but was reproduced in facsimile by the Camden Society in 1868, Vols. xciv and xcvii. There is an exact reproduction of the epitaph: there is no picture of the tablet and, although the epitaph is given line for line and with the same spelling, the dates differ. Spenser, the epitaph concludes, was "born in London in the Year 1516: and Died in the Year 1598.

Again the variation is curious, hitting as it does upon the same date of the death afterwards adopted by the restorers of the tablet. The Birth date 1516 might of course be a slip of the pen for 1510, the o in Dingley's MSS being misread for a 6, but the mistake of the 8 cannot be accounted for in this way.

It was in 1778 that the tablet was restored by private subscription. Shakspeare's at Stratford had received attention in 1748, but in the former case, although the exact shape and adornment was preserved as represented in the Folio of 1679, and although the wording, spelling and arrangement of lines strictly followed, the dates were altered to read "He was born in London in the Yeare 1553

and died in the Yeare 1598. Yet, as we have seen, for one hundred and eighty years after Spenser's death the dates 1510 and 1596 remained unchanged by his contemporaries and those who ought to have been best acquainted with the facts.

And there the matter remains—a mystery.

Mrs. E. W. Gallup (whose claim to have deciphered in the Shakespeare plays and other books Bacon's Biliteral Cypher is defended in the following pages by Mr. Curtis) contends that the original monument to Spenser having crumbled in a century, it is possible from the exact reproduction of it in an engraving in the 1679 edition of the "Faerie Queen" to decipher a hidden message inscribed upon the stone. A small inner space at the west end contains the MS named. She added that until the monument is taken apart we cannot know whether or not this inner space was left undisturbed in its reconstruction. If the original was an entire ruin, the MS is lost: if not, the inner chamber may remain intact with the manuscripts as originally placed. Careless workmen would not be looking for and might not observe indications of a hidden receptacle in a crumbling stone. According to the Biliteral cypher Bacon informs us that he purchased several names under which he wrote. "Spenser, Greene, Peele, Marlowe, have sold me theirs—two or three others I have assumed upon certain occasions, beside the one I bear among men." ("Biliteral Cypher of Sir Francis Bacon; Pt. iii," Elizabeth Wells Gallup, Detroit, U.S.A., Howard Publishing Co., London, Gay and Hancock, Ltd.)

The late Mr. Alfred Mudie discovered in the "Shepherd's Calendar," together with the other works of England's Arch Poet Edmund Spenser, Anno Dom. 1617, "in the Aegloga Prima two 'straight acrostic' signatures of 'Francis Bacon' and four of 'Bacon'."

There are similar acrostic signatures to Introductory Verse I of the "Faerie Queene" ("The Self-named William Shake-speare," Alfred Mudie, London, Cecil Palmer, 1929.)

Finally Mr. B. G. Theobald in "Francis Bacon Concealed and Revealed." (London, Cecil Palmer, 1930),

believes that the inscription on the monument besides coupling Bacon and his mask Spenser reveals that the Rosicrucian Fraternity, as he describes it, was responsible for the tablet, and the unknown editor of the 1679 Folio being in the secret disclosed this fact. In Mr. Theobald's judgment the cumulative effect of the cipher revelations in the monument and epitaph form an unanswerable argument in favour of the identity of Bacon and Spenser.

SHAKE-SPEAR, BACON AND GERVINUS.

By ALICIA A. LEITH.

GEORG GOTTFRIED GERVINUS (1805-1871) is one of Germany's eminent literary and political Historians. Scholarship at Heidelberg University, mastership at Frankfort, a travelling tutorship to a young Englishman travelling through Italy was followed by a Professorship of History and Literature at Göttingen. Study at Heidelberg, Darmstadt and Rome brought him the distinction of an Honorary Professorship of German Literature at Heidelberg University. He became Deputy in the National Assembly for Saxony, where a company of English Strolling Players, which included a son of Lord Dorset, Bacon's friend, played Shake-spear's dramas in 1586.

The Commentary by Gervinus on Shake-spear, in four volumes, published in 1849,* is the subject of this article. Vision and imagination aided this remarkable man to formulate an idea newly born in Germany in 1849, in the Commentary just referred to. He writes: "Many volumes are written . . . to make Shakespeare one and the same person as the philosopher Bacon. In philosophy and poetry Shakespeare and Bacon stand alone among men: all competitors vanished from their side, and they could give forth laws for art and science which it is incumbent even upon present ages to fulfil." Certainly Bacon gave forth such laws: it was in the service of the arts and the sciences that he tells us he spent his vacations.

Gervinus affirms Bacon's interest in the theatre, saying, "Francis Bacon once in his youth in Gray's Inn, took part in a representation," reminding us that Sir William Davenant, in a letter to his wife, wrote that Bacon had himself played before Queen Elizabeth. In Wats's edition of the "Advancement of Learning," Bacon complains of

* Translation by F. E. Bunnett. Revised edition 1875. Smith Elder. 1862.

Shake-spear, Bacon and Gervinus. 33

the condition of the stage in his day, contrasting it with the Ancients' theatre, the aim of which was virtue.

Gervinus finds Bacon's Essays full of maxims of experience that seem to him nothing less than striking titles for the plays of Shake-spear.

The appearance in print about eight years after Shaksper's arrival in London of "Venus and Adonis" (1593) and the "Rape of Lucrece" (1594), in all their cultured perfection and moral beauty, is made a special point of by Gervinus, who says "the poet knows that he is sketching, not the image of human love in which mind and soul have their ennobling share, but the image of a purely sensual desire, which purely animal, like an empty eagle, feeds on its prey." Adonis' rebuke to his temptress that her love for him is not the pure divine thing it should be, is not only quoted by Gervinus in evidence of the purity of the poet's soul, but he points out that there is more alluring warmth in the chaste beauty of "Lucrece" than in any passage of "Venus and Adonis." "These early poems," says our Commentator, "disclose the learned Latin school, in the honey-tongued poet is the sweet, witty soul of Ovid."

Gervinus observes that Shake-spear's great dramatic object was to show virtue her own feature; spiritual ideas pervade each of his works; both Bacon and Shake-spear follow Aristotle in teaching that Virtue lies in a just medium between two extremes. Especially interesting to us is the discovery by Gervinus that Shake-spear's plays reflect the myths and legends of the Ancients, seeing how beloved these were of Bacon.

Gervinus assures us that Shake-spear's moral system is a Christian one; that Shakspeare sets aside rigid law and places free inclination in its stead; "He is a man whose course and example can never with impunity be forsaken, whose merit cannot be measured by poetic greatness alone, and whose works have often been called a secular Bible; . . . so exalted is it in soundness and certainty of judgment in matters of art, custom, politics and religion."

Having restored the religion of Shake-spear, Bacon

34 Shake-spear, Bacon and Gervinus.

must be cleared from unfounded charges of atheism and deism "brought against him by fanatical and sectarian zealots," according to Gervinus. We shall do well to remember the tribute of the Public Orator of Cambridge, George Herbert, in one of his eulogistic Latin Addresses to Bacon on the occasion of his visit to the university with James I and Herbert's personal devotion to his own and his Mother's friend, Francis Bacon, whom he calls "Master of all Arts, Priest of all Souls." His verses, on the death of Bacon, were the sweetest of all the "Elegies Verulamiani."

If we study Bacon's "Confession of Faith" in Ball's 1837 edition of Bacon's works, vol. 1, page 337, and the pages of the "Advancement of Learning," pages 31-35, where theology, divinity and the nature of angels and spirits are the subjects, no one can doubt his sound divinity and theology, or his faith and loyalty to that Church which he championed so effectively during the reign of James I. Bacon's profound scholarship made him the close companion of Bishop Launcelot Andrewes in the translation of our Bible, published 1661. He was deeply concerned with Divine prophecy, Divine philosophy, Divine or inspired theology, "the haven and Sabbath of man's contemplations, the knowledge of which," he says, "sufficeth to convince atheism, but not to inform religion." "We should not attempt to draw down the mysteries of God to our reason, but raise and advance our reason to the Divine Truth." If Bacon's thought is reflected in Shake-spear, as Gervinus assures us it is, his religion and deep faith are also to be found in the Plays. Bacon's faith in "the Blessed Seed of the Woman, Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the world, . . . the Eternal Son of God" is echoed on John of Gaunt's dying lips, ". . . the world's Ransom, blessed Mary's Son." (*Richard II*, Act II, Sc. 1); by the King in *Henry IV*, Part I, Act I, Sc. 1, "Those holy fields, over whose acres walked those blessed feet, which fourteen hundred years ago were nailed for our advantage on the bitter Cross," and by Clarence in *Richard III*, Act I, Sc. 4, "I charge you, as you hope to have redemption, by Christ's dear

blood, shed for our grievous sins." Redemption, the great point of faith with Bacon, is never long absent from Shake-spear's written word. We find two more allusions in the play of *Richard III*, in King Edward's speeches. "I every day expect an embassy, from my Redeemer, to redeem me hence," and in another place "the precious Image of our dear Redeemer." Again and again Bacon refers in his Confession of Faith to the Mediator, calling him "Head of the Saints and one with God, . . . Saviour of the world. . . . Sacrifice for sin . . . accomplishing the redemption and restitution of man."

Shake-spear's loyalty to the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church is reflected in Bacon's intimate friendship with Archbishop Tenison, and discovers itself in *Henry VIII*, where Archbishop Cranmer accepts the position of God-father to the little Princess Elizabeth; and crowns her with heavenly blessings as England's Primate should.

Marriage with Shake-spear is a sacred rite. "You shall not stay alone," says Friar Lawrence to Romeo and Juliet, "till Holy Church incorporate two in one," while Prospero, beloved of Shake-spear, again enjoins the "Rigid law" of marriage, Act IV, Sc. 1, when he ordains sacred "Ceremonies . . . with full and holy rite."

We should here note Prospero's high tribute to the power of prayer in his Epilogue. "My ending is despair, unless I be relieved by prayer, that pierces so, that it assaults Mercy itself, and frees all faults."

Portia, in the *Merchant of Venice*, Act III, Sc. 5, confesses: "I have toward Heaven breathed a secret vow, To live in prayer and contemplation," giving us to understand where she obtains inspiration.

Having seen how dying King Edward welcomes the embassy of angels, we would now pass to the death of Katherine of Aragon, more saint than queen, sitting, as she says, and meditating on that celestial harmony she goes to (Act IV, Sc. 2, of *Henry VIII*). Her vision is one of celestial peace, "a blessed troupe . . . whose bright faces cast a thousand beams upon her like the sun . . . and bring her garlands," which she, so holy, feels she is not worthy yet to wear.

36 Shake-spear, Bacon and Gervinus.

Shake-spear, like Bacon, delights in the thought of angels, the spiritual denizens of Heaven. Bacon says the nature of angels and spirits is an "Appendix of theology, both divine and natural, . . . neither inscrutable nor interdicted." Enumerating their several orders, he tells us the first is that of the angels of love. In Shake-spear there are over sixty allusions to Angels, among which Hamlet's spontaneous cry of "Angels and ministers of grace, defend us," and Horatio's farewell, "Good-night sweet prince, and flights of angels sing thee to thy rest," come quickly to memory. Helena's high tribute to her home, in Act III, Sc. 2, of "All's Well," must have its place here: "The air of Paradise did fan that house, and angels officed all."

Cassio's benediction upon lovely Desdemona ("Othello," Act II, Sc. 1): "The grace of Heaven, before, behind thee, and on every hand, Enwheel thee round." Le Beau's aspiration "Hereafter in a better world than this, I shall desire more love and knowledge of you" ("As You Like It," Act I, Sc. 2), and the felicity in which Hamlet and his friend hope to meet above, are all magnificent evidence of Shake-spear's thought running parallel with Bacon's about the "haven and Sabbath of man's contemplation."

My best tribute to Gervinus and his fine Commentary is paid, in obedience to his behest to seek out in Shake-spear what occupied him deeply. "These pages," he wrote, "are not a trifling recreation, for they treat of one of the richest and most important subjects which could be chosen. For these reflections concern a man who by nature was so lavishly endowed; . . . no man in any age or nation, in any branch of knowledge exhibits the riches of genius, natural endowments, original talent and versatility of power that were so great in him." For Shake-spear is "the poet who hardens and sharpens the spirit for actual and active life in its widest extent . . . and raises the soul far above all barriers to the contemplation of all eternal blessings."

THE CRYPTOGRAPHER'S CORNER.

IN these days the subject of cryptography has so completely died out as a topic of general interest, that many people do not realise how widespread this study was in Tudor times. The very fact that numerous important treatises on the subject were published during that era is sufficient evidence that there must have been readers for such literature. Not only was a knowledge of cipher codes essential in political and diplomatic circles, as it still is today, but among men of all ranks it was frequently necessary as a means to safety in those dangerous days of religious and political persecution. Literary men, also, took up this study and seemed to enjoy it as a pastime; so that many specimens of acrostics, anagrams, numerical ciphers, and similar devices may be seen in the books of that period.

If, as we believe, Francis Bacon had many important secrets to conceal regarding his own career and the history of his times, it is natural that he should have selected this method as one means to that end. That he had thoroughly studied the subject, invented systems of his own, and was in all respects a master cryptographer admits of no doubt. Accordingly the search for such hidden information is not only legitimate but necessary to an understanding of his character, his genius and the immense scope of his life-work.

Holding these ideas in view we believe it will accord with the wishes of our readers that we should present from time to time in the pages of *BACONIANA* selected examples of cipher devices to be found in the literature of the Tudor period, especially of course in that which is connected with Francis Bacon.

In the present issue we purpose to describe some of the work accomplished in this field by the late Alfred Mudie; who, in 1929 published a book under the title of "The Self-named William Shakespeare."

The proposition he put forward was that Francis Bacon inserted a secret signature either at the beginning or at the end of every literary work of which he was the author; and the nature of the signature was as follows. He

38 The Cryptographer's Corner.

arranged for the text of, say the first verse of a poem so that if we take the first f in the text, then the next r, then the next a, and so on until the name Francis Bacon has been spelled out, the 'n' of Bacon will be the last n in the text. Unless these two conditions are fulfilled, the device is not genuine. Very often the name Bacon alone is found in this manner, sometimes repeated twice or even three times; but always commencing on the first 'b' of the text and finishing on the last 'n.' Sometimes, too, the name commences at the end of the poem or paragraph and finishes at the beginning; that is, it works in the reverse direction. Mr. Mudie argued that when a number of such signatures have been found, any theory of chance must be ruled out, and the only reasonable conclusion is that the author inserted these devices for the express purpose of indicating his claim to the work in question.

We give below a few characteristic examples of these signatures, which speak for themselves. In order to facilitate the task of following them out we have printed the letters of the significant names in heavy type.

LUCRECE, 1594

First stanza.

From the besieged **A**rdea all **i**n post,
Borne by the trustlesse wings of false desire,
Lust-breathed Tarquin leaves the Roman host,
And to **C**olatium beares the lightlesse fire,
Which in pale em**b**ers hid, lurkes to **a**spire,
And girdle with embrac**i**ng flames, the wast
Of **C**olat**i**ne's fair love, Lucrece the chaste.

Result (a) Francis Bacon.

From the **b**esieged **A**rdea all in post,
Borne by the trustlesse wings of false desire,
Lust-breathed Tarquin leaves the Roman host,
And to **C**olatium beares the lightlesse fire,
Which **i**n pale em**b**ers hid, lurkes to **a**spire,
And girdle with embrac**i**ng flames, the wast
Of Colat**i**ne's fair love, Lucrece the chaste.

Result (b) Bacon, Bacon.

The Cryptographer's Corner. 39

"JUPITER'S LABEL" IN CYMBELINE.

When as a Lyons whelpe, shall to himselfe unknown,
without seeking finde, and bee embraced' by a peece of
tender Ayre: And when from a stately Cedar shall be lopt
branches, which being dead many yeares, shall after
revive, bee joynted to the old Stocke, and freshly grow,
then shall Posthumus end his miseries, Britaine be
fortunate, and flourish in Peace and Plentie.

Result (a) Francis St. Albans.

When as a Lyons whelpe, shall to himselfe unknown,
without seeking finde, and bee embrac'd by a peece of
tender Ayre: And when from a stately Cedar shall be lopt
branches, which being dead many yeares, shall after
revive, bee joynted to the old Stocke, and freshly grow,
then shall Posthumus end his miseries, Britaine be
fortunate, and flourish in Peace and Plentie.

Result (b) Saint Albans, Saint Albans.

SHAKSPERE'S EPITAPH IN STRATFORD CHURCH.

Stay passenger, why goest thou by so fast?
Read, if thou canst, whom envious death hath plast
Within this monument; Shakspeare with whome
Quick nature dide; whose name doth deck ys tombe
Far more than cost; sith all yt he hath writt
Leaves living art but page to serve his witt.

Result (a) Francis Bacon.

Stay passenger, why goes thou by so fast?
Read, if thou canst, whom envious death hath plast
Within this monument; Shakspeare with whome
Quick nature dide; whose name doth deck ys tombe
Far more than cost; sith all yt he hath writt
Leaves living art but page to serve his witt.

Result (b) Bacon Bacon.

BACON WROTE THE SHAKESPEARE PLAYS.

Reason III.

The signatures of William Shakspeare of Stratford show that he was not able to write with facility. Such a penman could not have written the Shakespeare plays which must have covered several thousand manuscript pages. The name "Shakespeare" printed on the title pages of some of the Shakespeare plays does not prove Shakspeare of Stratford was their author.

The signatures of Shakspeare are six in number. The first in date is that to a purchase deed of a house in Blackfriars dated the 10th March, 1613: the second is that to a mortgage of the same property dated the next day: the next three are those to his Will made in 1616 and the sixth is to Answers to Interrogatories administered to him in the course of a law suit. The writing is laboured, irregular and shaky and is not that of a person accustomed to use a pen. In the Purchase Deed the name "Shaksper" is written under the name William and apparently in different writing, and in the third signature to the Will the name "Shaksper," or whatever it may be, although written after the name William is not in the same line and not in the same kind of writing. The two "Williams" appear to have been written by the law clerk and Francis Collins respectively and Shaksper signed his name after them.

By no effort of imagination can either signature be made out to be Shakespeare or Shake-speare. The only existing signature that is clear is "Shaksper." Moreover the three signatures to the will, though written at the same time, are all different in character.

The name William "Shakespeare" or "Shake-speare" printed on the title pages of the Shakespeare Plays is spelled in a way neither Shakspeare of Stratford nor any member of his family ever adopted.

Bacon Wrote the Shakespeare Plays. 41

The name "Shakespeare" on a title page is no evidence of the identity of an author. During Shakspeare's lifetime three plays were published under the name "Shakespeare" and believed to be written by the Stratford actor. They are now regarded as spurious. In other words the name of "Shakespeare" to "The London Prodigal," "Sir John Oldcastle" and "A Yorkshire Tragedy" is rejected as evidence of Shakspeare's authorship. If a name on a title page is not to be taken as evidence in one case, it must not be taken as such in another.

THE SOCIETY'S LIBRARY.

AN APPEAL TO OUR MEMBERS.

In consequence of requests constantly being received by the Secretary for information as to library facilities, the Council has decided to form a circulating library, chiefly for the benefit of those living in the provinces, but also for those in or near London, since it is impossible to arrange for anyone to be in frequent attendance at the Society's Headquarters in Canonbury Tower.

Before announcing details of the scheme it will be necessary to make a collection of books most adapted for this purpose. They will fall mainly into two classes (a) books suitable for enquirers who come fresh to Baconian problems (b) books desired by more advanced students who may not possess copies in their own libraries. A considerable proportion of the volumes in the Society's library—one of the most extensive collections of Baconian literature in the country—consists of volumes which are old, costly or rare, and cannot be loaned for the purposes of a circulating library. Even the more modern ones are in many cases out of print and not easily obtainable from second-hand booksellers. Moreover a circulating library should have several copies of the same volume available for lending.

The library at Canonbury Tower possess duplicates of some books, and these could be utilised for the proposed scheme. Individual members also have kindly offered some books already. But this alone will not suffice, and therefore an urgent appeal is now made to all members who may possess more than one copy for this excellent purpose. Additional copies are needed of the following:

G. C. Cuningham . . .	<i>Bacon's Secret Disclosed.</i>
W. Hepworth Dixon . . .	<i>Personal History of Lord Bacon.</i>
Sir George Greenwood . . .	Any of his books.
George Hookham . . .	<i>Will o' the Wisp.</i>
Richard Ince . . .	<i>England's High Chancellor.</i>
Basil E. Lawrence . . .	<i>Notes on the Authorship of the Shakespeare Plays and Poems.</i>
Lord Penzance . . .	<i>The Bacon-Shakespeare Controversy.</i>
Edwin Reed . . .	<i>Bacon v. Shakspere; Francis Bacon our Shakespeare; Bacon and Shakespeare Parallelisms.</i>
Mrs. Henry Pott . . .	<i>Thirty-two Reasons, etc. Francis Bacon and his Secret Society.</i>
W. T. Smedley . . .	<i>The Mystery of Francis Bacon.</i>
E. W. Smithson . . .	<i>Baconian Essays.</i>
R. M. Theobald . . .	<i>Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light.</i>
Judge Webb . . .	<i>The Mystery of William Shakespeare.</i>
Charles Williams . . .	<i>Bacon.</i>
W. L. Goldsworthy . . .	<i>Ben Jonson and the First Folio.</i>

Please write as quickly as possible to the Hon. Secretary at 15, New Bridge Street, London, E.C.4, saying what books you are willing either to give or to loan, whether they are included in the above list or not.

REVIEWS.

SHAKESPEARE CRITICISMS: AN ESSAY IN SYNTHESIS. By C. Narayana Menon (Oxford University Press. 5s.)

The avowed object of this book is to show that almost everything written about Shakspeare is true. Its author, notwithstanding his extensive knowledge of the work of Shakespearian critics and commentators, fails to achieve it because in the very nature of things failure was inevitable.

"The kernel of every Shakespearian play," writes Dr. Menon, "is the potential in us and that potential is our sympathetic imagination by means of which we identify ourselves with Othello and the other tragic figures."

The pleasure of seeing, we are told, is not passive; the Roman plebians rejoiced at the spectacle of Caesar's triumph because in imagination they were at one with Caesar. The bird that looks on while another eats the fruit imaginatively attains the latter's experience. God Himself is not only the spectator, but also the actor inasmuch as He is the reality behind all appearances.

Similarly when witnessing a play a man is both spectator and actor.

It is surely only necessary to state these premises of Dr. Menon in order to refute them. The short reply to them is that we are neither God nor Othello, nor the other bird and we are not spectator and actor at the same time and in the same place. It is simply not true that "we do not see Lear, we are Lear." We each of us live in the shadow of a veil which no man's hand, not even Shakspeare's, can lift. Our perceptions are bounded by ourselves. We cannot see beyond our own shadows, nor above our own heads, and we march among the phantoms of our own minds. If you and I were standing on a cliff together, we both should be able to realise the sea was gray below us, that the wind blew strong and cold, and that the sky was dark with the promise of storm. Yet it might chance that of activity in the harbour, you saw nothing clearly: of nets being hauled in and sails taken down and, while I stood looking at these things which for you were non-existent, the scream of sea-birds and the song of the wind might reach your ears, but never pierce my silence. Nor, if we spent day and night together seeking to share perceptions and communicate our impressions to each other should I be able to make you see, nor you to make me hear.

Imaginative experience thus differs with every reader and every time of reading and a drama exists for us in innumerable degrees. The state of mind of the reader or spectator of a Shakespearian play to-day cannot be that of Sir Roger de Coverley, of whose behaviour at the performance of "The Distrest Mother" Addison writes in "The Spectator." This is one of the celebrated instances of complete delusion—entire sympathetic absorption of the spectator's mind. His is rather a double consciousness.

There is a French proverb that you cannot at once join in a procession and look out of the window and the pleasure of the Roman crowd was perhaps not as much due to the fact that it identified itself with Caesar's triumph as that it was enjoying in imagination a lively sense of his favours to come.

Rousseau was nearer the truth than Dr. Menon when he said that people enjoy tragedy on the stage as a means of seeing people suffer without suffering themselves.

It is not in imaginative identification, if such a thing be possible, that we realise the underlying unity which besides giving significance to the thousand criticisms of "Hamlet" enables us to see the Court of Denmark and the world behind his mask and sicken with his malady of thought. Indeed it is not in the world of imagination at all that in our opinion we pass from dream to reality. This experience is a spiritual achievement of the highest order and is an extremely rare one, occurring for most of us only once or twice in a lifetime. To our minds Hamlet cannot be mad and not mad; Ophelia is either a virgin or not. In a world of time and space everything that has been written about Shakespeare is not true, except (if he be true to himself and his own vision) for the writer. A great book may indeed unite men. It may indeed resolve inner conflicts which hinder the acceptance of values, and one of the peculiar characteristics of Shakespeare's book is undoubtedly that it widens sympathetic insight, but these things are not the communion of saints nor that sacramental relation which transcends all imagination. We are told that the child's appreciation of literature is as valid as Saintsbury's and a little later on that "Professor Bradley's Hamlet" by Walkley and "Hamlet Once More" by Robertson, illustrate the worst type of ignorance—that of the learned. We are quite unable to understand why their appreciation is not as valid as that of the child. Ignorance is undeveloped knowledge. Walkley and Robertson are ignorant. Neither Walkley nor Robertson, who are ignorant, nor Dr. Menon, who is wise, is wrong. We are afraid that our own appreciation of this part of the argument is not valid at all if we understand what the word "valid" means in this association. We are not, we confess, quite certain that we do. We are told that to write a fourth rate book is a sin, to popularise it a crime. What is the difference in degree or kind in these two illegalities and, if all appreciation is equally valid, what is a fourth rate book? There would seem to be abundant room for definition for first, second, third and fourth class books. Bhagavada Gita and Shakespeare are first class books, but who is to bring in the reader or publisher guilty of being fourth class if all appreciation is valid? We do not like to imagine the child and Dr. Menon failing to reach agreement whether the latest best seller is really fourth class or not.

Self-knowledge, Dr. Menon proceeds, comes by intensive study of the few books that bear it. Here again for Dr. Menon "Rudin" is but a poor edition of "Hamlet." For a Russian critic "Hamlet" is but a poor edition of "Rudin," and neither could bear intensive study by the other.

When we regard "Hamlet" as being created anew by each spectator, it makes no difference whatsoever according to Dr. Menon whether it was written before the flood or yesterday by Bacon masquerading as Shakespeare. What does this mean? Surely it

is we who have to create "Hamlet" anew for ourselves. We have to recognise him as a person distinct from us and yet we are Hamlet. This is the author's theory of imaginative identification. Through this recognition of the drama (most effectively in the tragedies) we are offered the key to the riddle of Hamlet and ourselves from outside. We should have thought it a matter of some concern before we began the process of creating Hamlet anew for ourselves what materials were at our disposal. Hamlet is Shakespeare. He speaks with Shakespeare's tongue, thinks Shakespeare's thoughts and reflects in some degree Shakespeare's personality. Every work of art must express the personality of its author. Shakespeare's work is no exception. So far as we are ignorant of Shakespeare we must be ignorant of his masterpieces and our own creation or perception of them must be incomplete.

If Shakespeare is for all time he was also of his age. He was not separated from Elizabethan humanity and it is difficult to resist the impression that the process of imaginative identification, if it does not include these things, will either degenerate into day dreaming or will resemble that celebrated portrait of the Absolute—a page of virgin white carefully covered by a sheet of tissue paper. Such we are really afraid may be the end of the quest for imaginative identification.

We think Dr. Menon's initial mistake lies in his view of originality, the desire for which he says Shakespeare outgrew. What is originality? It is not new material, for Dr. Menon is quite right, the old is the best. It is familiar material, but rendered fresh by the imagination which renews its life, makes it significant for us, vitalises and creates the illusion of originality. Imagination is partly a faculty by which the mind realises for itself the material presented to it, and Shakespeare's theatre, rightly considered, is not a place in which to seek escape from the actual experiences of life, but a place in which to seek refuge from the unrealities of day to day living in the contemplation of life realised. That is life made real—brought to life by imagination. The great defect of the theatre, and incidentally of several of the Shakespeare plays themselves, is that the fabled life portrayed for us is much less real than the actual life experienced for ourselves, and we therefore grow weary because we have already imagined much more than the dramatist has imagined for us. With the Shakespeare masterpieces, however, our experience is reversed. What we have never made real ourselves is by them made real for us and we escape from chaos into life. In this power to set orderly before us the jumbled fragmentary experiences of humanity is the secret of Shakespeare's originality and indeed all originality in art.

We are surprised to hear that Shakespeare is not as neglected in India as he undoubtedly is in England. We should have thought that the mind of the West and that of the Orient looked at Shakespeare with different eyes and that his conservatism, especially his sympathy with the Feudal past and traditions, the superiority of the aristocracy, his idea of absolute personal monarchy by Divine Right, and his assertion of the dependence of woman upon man and, above all, the absence in his work of any synthesis of his experience of life, would have alienated him from those for whom tragedy is not a fundamental element in human destiny. There is no tragedy in Indian literature and for the devout Hindu as indeed to the

orthodox Christian tragedy is incidental only to this transitory life of illusion. For Catholics like Bossuet the one tragedy was played on Calvary, and in the end it was not a tragedy at all. So for the believing Christian no tragedy is possible among men. The attitude of the religious Indian is for different reasons very much the same. "Is not pain a fancy, and this world a cloud?"

Yet one of the most magnificent tributes to Shakespeare was that of Tagore contributed to "The Book of Homage."

"When by the far-way sea your fiery disc appeared from behind the Unseen, O poet, O sun, England's horizon felt you near her breast, and took you to be her own.

She kissed your forehead, caught you in the arms of her forest branches, hid you behind the mist-mantle and watched you in the greensward where the fairies love to play among meadow flowers.

A few early birds sang your hymn of praise while the rest of the woodland choir were asleep.

When at the silent breaking of the Eternal you rose higher and higher till you reached the mid-sky, making all quarters of heaven your own.

Therefore at this moment, after the end of centuries, the palm groves by the Indian sea raise their tremulous branches to the sky murmuring your praise."

SHAKESPEARE'S SONNET SEQUENCE. By Denys Bray. London: Martin Locker. 12s. 6d.

Sir Denys Bray's book is a re-statement of his argument in "The Original Order of Shakespeare's Sonnets" (1925). The new sonnet order was adopted in 1934 by the editor of "The New Temple Shakespeare."

The author is concerned with a purely literary problem—have the Sonnets come down to us in their true order: if not, is it possible to reconstruct it. Sir Denys Bray answers the first question of course in the negative: his reconstruction involves a microscopical examination of the technique of the Sonnets for traces of carrying on by Shakespeare of the sense of one Sonnet into another and results in a new order which produces a far more coherent and readable series by the application of a perfectly mechanical criterion.

But the reconstruction throws no light on the real Problem of the Sonnets. It accepts the Fair Youth, the Dark Lady and the Rival Poet, but leaves us as much as ever in the dark as to their identity and that of the "onlie begetter" and as to how Thomas Thorpe came to publish "these ensuing Sonnets." The author's conjecture that Shakespeare broke up the sequence himself—the Sonnets were too glorious for him to destroy—because he sought to ensure against the unmasking of his liaison with a married woman and of his complaisance in sharing her with a well-beloved friend—these conclusions are reached by Sir Denys with no certitude but with no feelings of uneasy disquiet. They are conclusions for which, of course, he would be the last to claim originality, but their validity depends upon premises which we think are highly questionable. It has been forcibly argued that the Sonnets were not published in

1609. Indeed Sir Denys Bray admits that with the exception of the fact that Alleyn the actor bought a copy the same year for fivepence, and the possibility that Drummond in 1614 referring to poems and sonnets as lately published may have been referring to Shakespeare's there is no reference to the Sonnets in contemporary literature. If the Sonnets were not published in 1609 Sir Denys' reconstruction and the story it certainly clarifies vanish and gives place to one which we think very much more consistent with the Real Shakespeare.

Mr. Alfred Dodd in a recent lecture to the Bacon Society pointed out that the evidence of Alleyn's purchase is suspect. His diary was for long in possession of Collier who was responsible for innumerable forgeries, mis-readings and mis-copying, some of these having been discovered in Alleyn's own papers and in Henslow's Diary. Assuming, however, the genuineness of the Diary note, it does not necessarily refer to the "1609 Quarto", but to the Medley of Sonnets and Poems actually printed under Shakespeare's name. It was not until 1766 that it was claimed that the Sonnets of Shakespeare were published in the lifetime of their supposed author, and none of the editors of Shakespeare before that year for more than 140 years referred to the existence of the 1609 Quarto. This is not the place to refer to an interpretation of the Sonnets which will alone pluck out the heart of their mystery: we are only concerned with Sir Denys Bray and may in conclusion express the view, that no reconstruction, however ingenious and well argued, can possibly bring the Poems of Shakespeare and the life of the Stratford player within planetary space of each other.

Many theories there are which seek to identify these figures—the Fair Youth, the Dark Lady and the rest—but not one will stand investigation and none of them is supported by a shred of evidence. William Shakspeare is unknown to have set eyes either upon the Earls of Pembroke and Southampton or Miss Fitton. Even supposing Sir Denys' theory to be correct, Francis Bacon is much more likely to have been the author of Shakespeare's Sonnets than William Shakspeare of Stratford.

CORRESPONDENCE.

TO THE EDITORS OF *BACONIANA*.

Dears Sirs,

The following notice is extracted from a booksellers' catalogue:—

“Lawrence Herbert; *The Life and Adventures of Common Sense*; 2 vols., printed for Montague Lawrence, 1769; £14: *the first work to cast doubt on Shakespeare*; this was followed by the Bacon-Shakespeare Controversy.”

Do your readers know of any books on the Baconian theory earlier than Lawrence's of 1769?

Yours truly,

W. A. VAUGHAN.

NOTE.—We do not know of any work earlier than 1769 which specifically deals with the Baconian theory, in the modern sense of that term. If any of our readers can mention one, we shall be glad to hear of it. But if Mr. Vaughan wishes to raise the question as to when doubts were first cast on Will Shakspeare's authorship of the “Shakespeare” plays and poems, we may refer him to an article by Mr. B. G. Theobald in our issue of January, 1935.—Eds.

NOTES AND NOTICES.

The following note is sent to us by one of our members, Mr. Alfred Weintraud. In a recent letter from Sir William Marris to *The Times* he recounts that while staying at Falloden with Lord Grey, *The Phoenix and the Turtle* was discussed, no one being able to interpret the third line:

With the breath thou giv'st and tak'st.

The question was submitted to Prof. W. L. Renwick, who solved it by referring to Pliny (Nat. Hist. lib. x, c. 15):

Ore eos parere aut coire vulgus arbitratur.

i.e., the vulgar believe that the crow generates its progeny by the mouth. It would be interesting to know Prof. Renwick's opinion whether Bacon or Shakespeare would be the likelier to be familiar with this parallel.

There may be another reference to Pliny in "King Richard II." In Act I, Sc. i., of that play it will be remembered that Bolingbroke, invited by Richard to be reconciled with Norfolk, cries that ere his tongue shall wound his honour so, his teeth should tear it and spit it bleeding into Mowbray's face. Bacon, referring to the story of Anaxarchus, writes (Works IV, 374) how he, questioned under torture, bit out his own tongue and spat it into the face of the tyrant. The story is derived from Diogenes Laertius: Bacon's version is taken either from Pliny or Valerius Maximus.

In the *Daily Express* of 24th October, Prof. J. Isaacs, of Kings College, London, is stated to have said to a reporter of that paper: "It is possible Shakespeare was not invited to write a tribute to Spenser. Apart from his youthful poems, he was known only as a hack dramatist." But Weever, according to Ingleby ("Centurie of Prayse" p. 16) in 1595 addressed a sonnet to Shakespeare mentioning *Romeo and Juliet*, *Richard III*, *Venus and Adonis* and *Lucrece*, and swore "Appollo begot them and none other." In 1598, the year before Spenser's funeral, Meres declared Shakespeare "the best for Comedy or Tragedy," while in the same year Barnfield addressed lines to Shakespeare, saying that the two poems had placed their author's name "in Fame's immortal book." —R.L.E.

The *Daily Mirror* leader-writer who signs himself "W.M.", and who, we are informed, is the editor, stated that Baconians had "no literary sense and few brains," together with some well worn arguments which have been demolished *usque ad nauseam*. This appeared in the issue of 5th November and was, no doubt, the editor's reaction to the exposure of that paper's exclusive report (with pictures!) of the secret opening of Spenser's grave during the night of 1st November. Mr. Eagle sent a challenge to "W.M." to meet him in a debate on a public platform or, if it could be arranged "on the air." As Hamlet says, "the rest is silence."

—R.L.E.

On 18th November last Mr. Theobald gave a lecture to the Petersfield Literary and Debating Society, whose members listened with keen attention to the arguments brought forward on behalf of Bacon's authorship of the Shakespeare works. Among the audience was Capt. C. J. P. Cave, a nephew of the late Sir George Greenwood, who did such yeoman service in pulling down the Stratford idol. Both Capt. Cave and others acknowledged that although they were comparatively familiar with many of the reasons for rejecting Shakspeare as the author, they had never heard the Baconian case effectively put, and were much impressed by the weight of evidence. It is perhaps worth adding that a local paper the *Hants and Sussex News* gave nearly two columns to a report of this lecture.

We understand that copies of the last issue of BACONIANA containing the Masque "Shakespeare and the Crisis" reached the Prime Minister and Herr Hitler whose attention was invited to certain quotations. Although we believe Herr Hitler knows no English, we hope that he appreciated them: they were appropriate to the troubled state of Europe and his responsibility for it.

The October BACONIANA received much notice and, we are glad to hear, commendation. It was referred to in the *Sunday Express* and provincial newspapers in Manchester and Bristol.

Even more gratifying was the praise we received from members of the Bacon Society, Miss A. A. Leith in particular writing us a delightful tribute which only modesty and considerations of space prevent us from printing in extenso.

Correspondents as far apart as Dublin, Brussels and the U.S.A. have welcomed BACONIANA, and this is particularly gratifying in view of the recent appeal in order to maintain its publication quarterly.

The Bacon-Shakspeare controversy has re-appeared in the columns of *Truth* and in the *Press and Mirror*. In the latter Mr. F. E. C. Habgood challenged a statement of Professor Crofts who

had been lecturing to the local Shakespeare Society that it was not until the eighteenth century that the authorship of "Shakespeare" had been attributed to Bacon, and referred the Professor to the satires of Marston and Hall in which Bacon is, of course, identified as "Labeo" and the author of "Venus and Adonis." In *Truth* the editor adopted the unusual course of adding comments of his own to the contributions of several members of the Bacon Society, finally stating that "There is no room to continue this controversy. But I must have one final word: we know more about Shakespeare's life than about the lives of most of his contemporaries, and there is absolutely no evidence, that a court of law would accept, that Bacon wrote the plays."

It would, of course, be a little difficult to satisfy a court of law sitting to-day that Bacon wrote the Shakespeare plays. Not only because ghosts cannot be cross-examined, but because modern laws of evidence would exclude much testimony that would be extremely material—some of it hearsay. We think, however, Shakspeare of Stratford would find it impossible to establish any claim at all, for the shreds of reputation offered as evidence in his favour could be quickly destroyed, as Baron Penzance showed in his "Judicial Summing Up of the Bacon-Shakspeare Controversy." This admirable summing up of both cases—(the author who was created Queen's Counsel in 1855, baron of the exchequer in 1860, judge in 1863 and Dean of the Arches Court in 1875 omitted to notice no fact or incident telling in favour of the defendant Shakspeare) published in 1902 is easily the most effective statement in judicial form of the facts upon which advocates on both sides of the controversy rely and, although the learned judge left the verdict to the jury of readers, there is no doubt in whose favour he would have given judgment if the issue had been left in his hands.

In "Notes and Queries" (December 3rd, 1938) Mr. H. Kendra Baker has been writing about "The Lady of the Strachy" in "Twelfth Night." He thinks there is an incident recorded in the memoirs of the period of one of the Queen's maids of honour who somewhere in the nineties created a sensation by eloping with a court official beneath her in social position. Both were imprisoned, but subsequently discharged with a caution. Mr. Kendra Baker cannot recall names and details. Is he referring perhaps to the Duchess of Somerset, who died in 1587? She was the widow of the Lord Protector and after his death married one of the gentlemen of her deceased husband's household.

The passage in "Twelfth Night" may have been suggested by "The Card of Fancy" which quotes several cases of ladies marrying beneath them.

One more result of the publicity given to the search for Spenser's

tomb has just come to our notice. In the current issue—the first—of a magazine called *Theatre-craft* there appears a one-act comedy by Mr. Sydney Box entitled "The Truth about Shakespeare." In his introductory note the author gives a summary of the reasons for opening Spenser's tomb, and makes it clear that it was this which gave him the idea for his playlet. He also suggests that his theory may be as plausible as that of the Baconians. The theory in question forms the basis of the comedy and is simply that the player Shakspeare, in order to ensure the success of the first performance of *Romeo and Juliet*, arranged with two intoxicated colleagues to spread a rumour that it was actually the work of Bacon. We do not suppose the author intends anyone to take him seriously, and our only reason for mentioning the incident is that it provides one more piece of evidence of the manner in which Baconian ideas are permeating the world. And even when, as in the present case, an opportunity is taken to poke fun at our beliefs, good results may follow by the mere fact that these are mentioned.

The subject of our new feature "Cryptographer's Corner" is the work of the late Mr. Alfred Mudie, whose book, "The Self-Named William Shakespeare," was published in 1929. The author's curious discoveries were received by the Press with complete silence. No notice whatever was taken of what to say the very least of them were a series of extraordinary coincidences.

Investigators, orthodox and unorthodox alike, have endeavoured to find any parallel to these "running signatures," but no such parallel has ever been found. The signature of "Shakespeare" could not be discovered in the work of Milton or Scott for example, but it is the *number* of those of Bacon in the Shakespeare Quartos and Folios which is remarkable. One reviewer indeed attempted to discredit Mr. Mudie's book by mis-representing the nature of his discoveries and indulging in ill-formed denunciation of the Bi-literal cipher alleged to have been concealed in the Shakespeare Plays and other literature; but this criticism, if by such name it can be described, was very successfully refuted by Mr. C. Y. Dawbarn who published a forcibly written pamphlet in reply thereto.

To Mr. Mudie himself the Bacon Society owes a great and enduring debt of gratitude, for one reason among many others that on his death he bequeathed a legacy of £500 which was to be devoted to the furtherance of the objects of the Society.

We are informed that in Kelly's Directory of Warwickshire, under the heading "Educational," there appears "The School of King Edward VI, Church Street, in which Shakespeare was educated," etc. On which it is permissible to comment, "if he ever went to school at all." Under the "Commercial" section we find "Shakspeare's Birthplace," with telephone number 2648. "Commercial" is deliciously appropriate!